



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/057,027

01/24/2002

Friedrich Jonas

Mo6935/LeA 34,765

3582

23416

7590

12/24/2009

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP

P O BOX 2207

WILMINGTON, DE 19899

EXAMINER

METZMAIER, DANIEL S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/24/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/057,027	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JONAS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Daniel S. Metzmaier	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1, 4-5 and 9 are pending.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 19 November 2009 has been entered.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicants' response filed on 19 November 2009 amends the specification at page 10, by inserting into the paragraph beginning at line 3 and ending at line 9 the parenthetical expression: "(which corresponds to Example 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,391,481) (U.S. Patent No. 6,391,481 is in the same family as EP- A 991 301))". Applicants also provide a marked up copy of the specification and a substitute specification.

Applicants (page 3, Remarks) assert the specification has been amended to insert the U.S. Patent No. 6,391,481, which is in the same patent family member as EP- A 991 301. Applicants further assert that applicants believe the specification has proper

Art Unit: 1796

written description and request the rejection be withdrawn. Applicants have not complied with the 37 CFR 1.57.

The following objections and rejections remain. See Decision by the Board of Appeals, Appeal No. 2009-000622, Application 10/057,027, page 6, mailed 22 September 2009<sup>1</sup>. See also 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.57. See MPEP § 608.01(p), I. Incorporation By Reference, 2, Improper Incorporation (8th ed., Rev. 5, August 2006).

“ . . . Any underlying objection or rejection (e.g., under 35 U.S.C. 112) should be made by the examiner until applicant corrects the improper incorporation by reference by submitting an amendment to amend the specification or drawings to include the material incorporated by reference. A statement that the material being inserted is the material previously incorporated by reference and that the amendment contains no new matter is also required. 37 CFR 1.57(f). . . . ”

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following rejection is made in the alternative to the rejections base on the prior are rejections, which follow.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1, 4-5, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicants improperly incorporate subject matter that was not present in the originally filed disclosure by amendment regarding making the claimed composition.

The amendment filed 19 November 2009 to the specification is an attempt to correct an “improper incorporation by reference”. Please see the present amendment and the summarization thereof above.

The reference to EP A-991 303 is made throughout applicants’ specification regarding the making of applicants’ invention<sup>2</sup>. It has been the Office position that the reference to EP A-991 303, specified in example 2, **constitutes essential subject matter** and this **has been uncontested** by applicants<sup>3</sup>.

The Board Of Appeals states<sup>4</sup> regarding the improper incorporation of essential subject matter: “ . . . Appellants' recourse is to correct the matter as provided in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.57(g). See MPEP § 608.01(p), I. Incorporation By Reference, 2, Improper Incorporation (8th ed., Rev. 5, August 2006).” Applicants response filed 19 November 2009 is believed to be in response to said statement by the Board of Appeals.

Applicants have not complied with the Rule or the MPEP<sup>5</sup> and the rejection is maintained in accordance with the MPEP as denoted above.

Rule 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.57 sets forth:

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter Decision, Appeal No. 2009-000622.

<sup>2</sup> Please see Decision, Appeal No. 2009-000622, pages 3 and 4, “Findings of Fact”.

<sup>3</sup> Please see Decision, Appeal No. 2009-000622, page 4, “Opinion”.

<sup>4</sup> Please see Decision, Appeal No. 2009-000622, page 6.

<sup>5</sup> See MPEP § 608.01(p), I. Incorporation By Reference, 2, Improper Incorporation (8th ed., Rev. 5, August 2006).

37 CFR 1.57. Incorporation by reference.

(a) Subject to the conditions and requirements of this paragraph, if all or a portion of the specification or drawing(s) is inadvertently omitted from an application, but the application contains a claim under § 1.55 for priority of a prior-filed foreign application, or a claim under § 1.78 for the benefit of a prior-filed provisional, nonprovisional, or international application, that was present on the filing date of the application, and the inadvertently omitted portion of the specification or drawing(s) is completely contained in the prior-filed application, the claim under § 1.55 or § 1.78 shall also be considered an incorporation by reference of the prior-filed application as to the inadvertently omitted portion of the specification or drawing(s).

(1) The application must be amended to include the inadvertently omitted portion of the specification or drawing(s) within any time period set by the Office, but in no case later than the close of prosecution as defined by § 1.114 (b), or abandonment of the application, whichever occurs earlier. The applicant is also required to:

(i) Supply a copy of the prior-filed application, except where the prior-filed application is an application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111;

(ii) Supply an English language translation of any prior-filed application that is in a language other than English; and

(iii) Identify where the inadvertently omitted portion of the specification or drawings can be found in the prior-filed application.

(2) Any amendment to an international application pursuant to this paragraph shall be effective only as to the United States, and shall have no effect on the international filing date of the application. In addition, no request to add the inadvertently omitted portion of the specification or drawings in an international application designating the United States will be acted upon by the Office prior to the entry and commencement of the national stage ( § 1.491) or the filing of an application under 35 U.S.C. 111 (a) which claims benefit of the international application.

(3) If an application is not otherwise entitled to a filing date under § 1.53(b), the amendment must be by way of a petition pursuant to this paragraph accompanied by the fee set forth in § 1.17(f).

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, an incorporation by reference must be set forth in the specification and must:

(1) **Express a clear intent to incorporate by reference by using the root words “incorporat(e)” and “reference” ( e.g., “incorporate by reference ”); and**

(2) Clearly identify the referenced patent, application, or publication.

(c) **“ Essential material ” may be incorporated by reference, but only by way of an incorporation by reference to a U.S. patent or U.S. patent application publication, which patent or patent application publication does not itself incorporate such essential material by reference.** “Essential material ” is material that is necessary to:

Art Unit: 1796

(1) Provide a written description of the claimed invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out the invention as required by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112;

(2) Describe the claimed invention in terms that particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention as required by the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112; or

(3) Describe the structure, material, or acts that correspond to a claimed means or step for performing a specified function as required by the sixth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

(d) Other material ( "Nonessential material ") may be incorporated by reference to U.S. patents, U.S. patent application publications, foreign patents, foreign published applications, prior and concurrently filed commonly owned U.S. applications, or non-patent publications. An incorporation by reference by hyperlink or other form of browser executable code is not permitted.

**(e) The examiner may require the applicant to supply a copy of the material incorporated by reference. If the Office requires the applicant to supply a copy of material incorporated by reference, the material must be accompanied by a statement that the copy supplied consists of the same material incorporated by reference in the referencing application.**

**(f) Any insertion of material incorporated by reference into the specification or drawings of an application must be by way of an amendment to the specification or drawings. Such an amendment must be accompanied by a statement that the material being inserted is the material previously incorporated by reference and that the amendment contains no new matter.**

**(g) An incorporation of material by reference that does not comply with paragraphs (b), (c), or (d) of this section is not effective to incorporate such material unless corrected within any time period set by the Office, but in no case later than the close of prosecution as defined by § 1.114(b), or abandonment of the application, whichever occurs earlier. In addition:**

**(1) A correction to comply with paragraph (b)(1) of this section is permitted only if the application as filed clearly conveys an intent to incorporate the material by reference. A mere reference to material does not convey an intent to incorporate the material by reference.**

**(2) A correction to comply with paragraph (b)(2) of this section is only permitted for material that was sufficiently described to uniquely identify the document.**

**(Emphasis added).**

More specifically, the initial or original specification having an improper incorporation by reference was deficient regarding 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.57(b)(1) and 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.57(c). Applicants attempt to correct 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.57(c) but have not yet complied with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.57 and MPEP § 608.01(p), I. Incorporation By Reference, 2, Improper Incorporation (8th ed., Rev. 5, August 2006).

An amendment that would be deemed to comply would include:

- (1) express their clear intent as specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.57(b)(1),
- (2) a copy, such as a certified translation, of the subject matter of EP A-991 303 to be incorporated to comply with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.57(e),
- (3) a statement in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.57(f).

### ***Double Patenting***

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).



7. Claims 1, 4-5 and 9 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 20 and 21 of copending Application No. 11/637,411. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because copending '411 is the broader genus claiming the species of the instant claims, *e.g.*, 3,4-polyethylenedioxythiophene / polystyrene sulfonate (polyanion), otherwise known in the art as PEDOT/PSS. See original claim 6 and 7 of '411.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 19 November 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Said arguments have been addressed in the above rejection under 35 USC 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel S. Metzmaier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1089. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David W. Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/Daniel S. Metzmaier/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796**

DSM